

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action dated August 19, 2003, and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office Action, claims 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto. Claims 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robb. However, claim 3 is indicated to be allowable if amended to overcome those Section 112, second paragraph rejections, and rewritten in independent form. As an initial matter, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for such early indication of allowable subject matter.

By the above amendments, the specification has been amended to correct a minor typographical error. Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 3, and claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added. Claim 6 has been amended to address the Section 112, second paragraph, rejection. Therefore, it is believed that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 and 4-7 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

The prior art references made of record by the Examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the claims as amended. It is noted that none of these references have been specifically applied by the Examiner against any of

the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated August 19, 2003, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1, 2, and 4-7 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ &
DOUGHERTY

By:



Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 412-1155 Ext. 16